THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

WRIT PETITION No.25349 OF 2005

Date:30.11.2005

Between:

B.Subramanyam

… Petitioner

AND

Sri Padmavathi Mahila Viswavidyalam.

… Respondent

ORDER:

The petitioner was appointed as a Watchman, through proceedings, dated 25.02.1988, along with five others. He was placed at serial No.4 in the order of merit. On 30.05.2003, the Vice-Chancellor of the respondent-University issued proceedings keeping the petitioner in-charge of Security and Watch and Ward

(for short 'the security'), until further orders. This arrangement was discontinued *vide* orders, dated 04.06.2005. The petitioner challenges the action of the respondent in denying him the benefit of being the in-charge of the security.

Sri P. Gangarami Reddy, the learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that on recognizing the ability and competence of the petitioner, the Vice-Chancellor placed him as in-charge of the security and the same was discontinued without any basis. He further contends that the respondent is trying to place a person unconcerned with the Watch and Ward Section as in-charge.

The learned standing counsel for the respondent, on instructions, submits that though the petitioner was kept as in-charge of the security, he had to be discontinued on account of the complaints received against him. She further contends that it is not a substantive post and the petitioner cannot claim any right in

it.

Even according to the proceedings, dated 25.02.1988, the petitioner is at serial No. 4 in the category of Watchman. The circumstances, under which he was kept in-charge of the security, are not evident from the order, dated 30.05.2003. There is no substantive post of in-charge of the security. At the most, it may be an internal arrangement. There is no Rule or Circular, which regulates such arrangement. Further, the petitioner is not the senior-most of the watchmen. Hence, the petitioner does not have any independent right. Therefore, the petitioner or for that matter any Watchman do not have any right to be posted as in-charge of the security. Much would depend upon the amount of confidence which the University reposes in such person. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant any relief to the petitioner. In case, the respondent proposes to put any person as in-charge of the security, the case of the petitioner shall also be considered and in particular the fact that he was kept in-charge on an earlier occasion.

Accordingly, the writ petition is disposed of. There shall be no order as to costs.

30.11.2005

kdl